



## As-Sawaa'iq as-Salafiyyah al-Mursalah 'Alal-Afkaar al-Qutubiyyah al-Mudammirah

### *Part 2: The Creed of Imaam al-Albaani on Actions and Imaan*

In Defence of the Creed of Imaam al-Albaani From the Neo-Qutubic Assault

O Sunni, that which most aptly describes the realities of the da'wah today is:

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, "As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)... **As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists...**" (Refer to "Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn")

## Contents

Foreword

Introduction

Concerning Actions and Their Position in Imaan

Part 1: **DO THE MURJI'AH SAY THIS?!**

Part 2: **PLAYING ON TERMINOLOGY**

Part 3: **THE DISHONESTY OF ABU FULAAN AL-KANADIE**

Part 4: **BETWEEN ABU FULAAN AL-KANADIE AND THE IMAAMS OF THE SUNNAH**

Part 5: **IMAAN HAS AN FOUNDATION (ASL) AND BRANCHES (FUROO')**

Closing Remarks

Appendix 1 : Questions and Answers with al-Anbari on Imaan, Kufr, Takfir and Irjaa

## Foreword

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

O you who believe! Fear Allaah as He should be feared, and die not except in a state of Islaam (as Muslims) with complete submission to Allaah. (Aali Imraan 3:103)

O mankind! Be dutiful to your Lord, Who created you from a single person (Adam), and from him (Adam) He created his wife [Hawwa (Eve)], and from them both He created many men and women and fear Allaah through Whom you demand your mutual (rights), and (do not cut the relations of) the wombs (kinship). Surely, Allaah is Ever an All-Watcher over you. (An-Nisaa 4:1)

O you who believe! Keep your duty to Allaah and fear Him, and speak (always) the truth. He will direct you to do righteous good deeds and will forgive you your sins. And whosoever obeys Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) he has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and made to enter Paradise). (Al-Ahzaab 33:70-71)

To proceed, verily the best speech is the Book of Allaah and the best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). And the worst of affairs are the newly invented matters, every newly-invented matter is an innovation, every innovation is misguidance and all misguidance is in the Hellfire.

## Introduction

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, **"As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)<sup>1</sup>... As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists..."** (Refer to "Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn")

You should know, O Sunni, that what has been stated by Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain is a pertinent and most appropriate and highly accurate description of the actual state of affairs today, and of the affairs of the Salafi Da'wah today and of the affairs of the "Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah", the Khawaarij of the Era. And know that another most pertinent and appropriate statement is:

**"All the Ahl ul-Ahwaa are united upon the hatred of Imaam al-Albaani and his manhaj (even though they may outwardly portray otherwise) and all of the Ahl ul-Ahwaa are united upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb (even though they may outwardly portray otherwise)."**

Remember, this well O Sunni, and many things will become as clear as daylight to you. In fact, if you understand this well and keep it in the back of your mind, much of the fitnah of today will be put in its proper context, and then you will see where the beautifiers of speech, the straying wanderers, those adulterated in their manhaj and who have only one concern, to busy the Ummah with takfir and haakimiyyah, you will then see where they stand and where they fit in.

Recently, a 112 page document emerged which passed itself off as a "Decisive Refutation of SalafiPublications.Com" and which comprised attempts to prove that Imaam al-Albaani shares with the Extremist Murji'ah in his views on Imaan and Takfir. The article was written by someone from Canada called Abu Huthayfah Yusuf al-Kanadie, and is actually centred around two individuals, Imaam al-Albaani and Shaikh Khaalid al-Anbari and attempts to ascribe Extremist Irjaa' to them both. The main bulk of the article is based around refuting the statements of Imaam al-Albaani – based upon some of his statements that occurred on cassette – and also refuting the clarifications of Khaalid al-Anbaree in his reply to the

<sup>1</sup> And at the same time we do not claim anyone is infallible after the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), rather everyone can err and can also be correct...

Permanent Committee, after their verdict concerning his book. The contents of the article can be summarised as follows:

- 1) Proving that Imaam al-Albaani does not hold that kufr can occur by actions
- 2) Proving that Imaam al-Albaani considers Imaan to be Tasdeeq
- 3) Proving that Khalid al-Anbari is an Extreme Murji'
- 4) Proving that Khalid al-Anbari twists and lies and distorts the sayings of the scholars
- 5) Proving that the verse in al-Maa'idah refers to the major kufr absolutely
- 6) Proving that the narrations from Ibn Abbaas in tafseer of the verse in Surah al-Maa'idah are weak and not to be relied upon and proving that Ibn 'Abbaas considered the verse in al-Maa'idah to be indicative of major kufr
- 7) Attempting to justify his position on ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed by quoting from many of the scholars of the Salaf on the issue of general legislation, tabdeel, secular law and the likes.
- 8) A refutation of SalafiPublications.Com by default, in all of these issues, since they have stood by the views of Imaam al-Albaani and Khalid al-Anbari
- 9) An illustration of the deceit of SalafiPublications.Com and their twisting and distorting the words of the Scholars.

And also many other subsidiary matters. In this series we will reply to the author of this document, and illustrate his nature and orientation and to answer his claims inshaa'allaah and also illustrate in the process, his ignorance, his invalid deductions, his making the words of the likes of Imaam al-Albaani, to carry meanings and contexts that they do not in fact carry and much more.

It is vital to point out that the reference points of this individual are the likes of Abu Baseer Mustafah Halimah – a well known Takfiri based in Syria, Safar al-Hawali, Mohammad Qutb and others from the neo-Kharijite Think Tank – who have emerged in the current times and have promoted the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb of takfir and haakimiyyah. And all of these are actually united upon the hatred of Imaam al-Albaani as we shall see in other discourses. It is also clear from the tone and nature of the author of this “Decisive Refutation” that his desperation is to prove, once and for all, that Imaam al-Albaani is upon Extremist Irjaa' and that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is major kufr, (alal itlaaq) absolutely. His confusion in this regard will be pointed out in a later discourse, if Allaah wills, as well as his selective quoting of certain statements, inshaa'allaah, and also his lack of familiarity with some of the sayings of our Scholars, such as Imaam Ibn Baaz and others. What is very apparent is that this individual is upon the Qutubi da'wah – even though he might proclaim otherwise – and has taken his teachings from Safar al-Hawali and Mohammad Qutb. We see his orientation from his isnaad, chain of narration, which is actually Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah, Safar al-Hawali, Mohammad Qutb, and this is why we say that he has affectations to the doctrine of Qutubism – even though he will negate it and deny it, yet his true referent points, and the books he has relied upon are the clearest of evidences to indicate that he is affected by Qutubism.

In Part 2, we look at the viewpoint of Imaam al-Albaani on actions and a reply to the doubts of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie.

## Concerning Actions and their Position in Imaan

Stated, the author of the so-called “Decisive Refutation”:

The quotations from *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, which we have related in the introduction of this project, is sufficient to demonstrate his separation of actions from *Kufr*, and the quotation is not ambiguous or unclear and it is certainly long enough so that no one could claim that we have taken the *Shaykh*'s words out of context. But to clarify the matter further, we have come across a cassette recording, during our research for this project, from a published tape and we will narrate a conversation between Khaalid Al-Anbaree and *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, in which *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee demonstrated his *Ijmaa'* quite clearly to Khaalid Al-Anbaree and wherein, the two of them even became in an argument of sorts on the subject of *Eemaan*, and what it necessitates. In the course of this excerpt, we will add our own footnotes to the text of their speech but we call Allaah as our witness that we fully to transcribe and translate this text accurately and fluidly so that no one can claim that we are misrepresenting or twisting the words of either of them.

The cassette tape we are narrating from is: “*At-Tah'reer li'Usool At-Takfeer*” produced by *Tasjilaat Eelaaf Al-Islaameeyah lil'Intaaj wa-Tawzee'*, dated *Al-Ramadhaan* 1416H., which is equivalent to February 10, 1996.

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** “Our *Shaykh*, what is the place of actions in *Eemaan*? And are they a condition for its completeness<sup>2</sup> or a condition its existence<sup>3</sup>? I hope for clarity on this matter. May Allaah bless you.”

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** “What we have understood from the evidences of the Book and the *Sunnah* and from the sayings of the *Imaams* from the *Sahabah* and the *Tabi'een* and the *Imaams* who have witnessed them is that whatever exceeds the actions of the heart and passes it to what has to do with the actions of the body, then it is a condition of the completeness and not a condition for its existence (of *Eemaan*).”

So this means that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not consider any actions to be from the conditions for the existence of *Eemaan*. Rather, he considered actions of the body to be a condition for its completeness. And this means that he did would consider a person to be a Muslim, even if he abandoned all the actions as long as all the conditions of *Eemaan* in the heart were present.

Fine, now come with us O Sunni, and let us proceed to lash this neo-Qutubite pseudo-intellectualism that aims to bring down the *Imaams* of the *Sunnah* and to raise high the affairs of the Innovators such as Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and the neo-Qutubite theoreticians of today who are promoting the manhaj of these people... let us illustrate this jahl, and this talbees, that has become a hallmark of those with affectations to the Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah...

<sup>2</sup> That is “Shart Kamaal”.

<sup>3</sup> That is “Shart Sihhah”.

## PART 1: DO THE MURJI'AH SAY THIS?!

Know, O Sunni, that the Murji'ah claimed that Imaan was either assent (tasdeeq) in the heart or knowledge (ma'rifah) in the heart, or tasdeeq in the heart and utterance upon the tongue, and they did not include actions within Imaan. Further, they claimed that the one who comes with Imaan (as they understood it) is perfect in his Imaan, and has Imaan like that of Jibreel and Mikaa'eel. So the one who merely had tasdeeq in his heart, or merely had knowledge in his heart, or had tasdeeq in the heart and also pronounced the Shahaadah, then his Imaan is complete, merely on account of this alone.

Extending from this principle, they then said that Imaan is a single entity and is not subject to increase and decrease.

Hence, the difference between them and Ahl us-Sunnah is that they claim Imaan is perfect and complete without actions, whereas Ahl us-Sunnah say that Imaan cannot be perfect except with actions.

In light of this, pay close attention to the saying of Shaikh Hussain Aal ash-Shaikh (Imaam of Masjid an-Nabawi), **"How can the verdict<sup>4</sup> ascribe to the Murji'ah the saying that actions are a condition for the perfection of Imaan, when the Murji'ah themselves do not even consider that Imaan can be deficient to begin with, such that it is then possible for Imaan to become perfect and complete??!"** (Refer to the cassettes 'Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad al-Haramayn', of Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi).

Understood?! Walhamdulillah...

Now pay careful attention to the following narrations:

Imaam al-Barbahari said: "Whoever says, 'Iman is speech and action, **it increases and decreases**' has left Irja', all of it, both its beginning and its end'." (Sharh us-Sunnah p.132) . And one before him, Imaam Ahmad was asked about the one who says '**Iman increases and decreases**'. He said, '**Such a one is free from Irjaa'**' (al-Mukhtar fi Usul us-Sunnah of Ibn al-Banna (p.89).

Reflect carefully here O Sunni, and note how the affirmation of Imaan increasing and decreasing, is itself an affirmation of actions being from Imaan, and this is why the Salaf freed the one who said Imaan increases and decreases from having Irjaa'.

Stated Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullaah), while commenting on at-Tahaawi's definition of Imaan as, "Affirmation (iqraar) with the tongue and attestation (tasdeeq) with the heart", so the Shaikh said, "I say: This is the madhhab of the Hanafi's the Maatureedees, in opposition to the majority of the Imaams such as Maalik, ash-Shaafi'ee, Ahmad, al-Awzaa'ee and others. For all of them added acting by the pillars on top of affirmation (iqraar). and attestation (tasdeeq). And the difference between these two madhhabs is not one that is related to form [while agreeing in principle], as the explainer (Ibn Abil-Izz al-Hanafi) – rahimahullaah – has

<sup>4</sup> Referring to the verdict of the Permanent Committee against the book of Shaihk Ali Hasan al-Halabi, "Fitnah of Takfir".

opined, using the proof that they (i.e. all of them, the Hanafiyyah included) are in agreement that the one who commits major sins is not expelled from Imaan, and that he is under the will of Allaah, if He wills He will punish him and if He wills He will forgive him. **For even if this agreement amongst them was correct, then if the Hanafiyyah were not in opposition to the majority of them (i.e. the Salaf) in their rejection of actions being from Imaan, they would have therefore, been in agreement with them in that Imaan is subject to increase and decrease, and that its increase is by way of obedience and its decrease by way of disobedience, while the evidences in the Book, the Sunnah and the narrations of the Salaf in this regard are in abundance. But the Hanafiyyah persisted upon this saying in opposition to all those clear and explicit evidences relating to increase and decrease, and then they began to make an unsound ta'weel (interpolation) of them, rather a futile ta'weel of them...".** (Aqeedat ut-Tahaawiyyah: Sharh wat-Ta'leeq).

And also the refutations of Imaam al-Albaani against the Murji'ah, even in recent times, on cassette, on the subject of increase and decrease are known and available. And whoever wishes to see the Imaam's treatment of this issue, let him refer to the cassette "Questions and Answers in Somalia on the Issue of Irjaa" of Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari, on the second side of which one will find Imaam al-Albaani refuting the Murji'ah on this point.



## PART 2: PLAYING ON TERMINOLOGY

The next thing we need to do, is to just dig slightly into what these terms (shart kamaal, shart sihhah) can be in reference to, so we can at least get to the concept level, and play with the concepts, instead of the terms.

Shaikh Ali Hasan stated, “And we believe that the believer who is perfect in his Imaan – is the one who performs the righteous actions and avoids the sinful actions – [and this is] implied in the correct and true principles [contained] in the understanding of an expression that has become widespread, and that is “condition of validity” or “condition of perfection” (“shart us-sihhah” or “shart ul-kamaal”) and this is but a terminological phrase, it is not permissible to deny it or to negate it, except after seeking clarification from the one who speaks with it: So if he means (by perfection, kamaal) that actions are not from Imaan, then it is extremely false and extreme misguidance...

And if he means the perfection (kamaal) that exists in accordance to the extent that righteous actions exist – **tied to Imaan – whether in abundance or very little** – in the sense that it can increase such that it reaches the peak (of a mountain) and that it can decrease such that nothing remains from it except the weight of an atom, **then we explain that this is the correct meaning but the wording is not correct**. Especially since the usage of the word “shart” (condition) in the view of the grammarians means “being external to the essence of a thing”, and this is extremely futile, since actions are actually from the reality of Imaan and its essence.

And this is how we behave with all of the various terminologies – in both negation and affirmation – as has been affirmed by our most notable Scholars, such as Shaikh ul-Islaam.” (Ar-Radd al-Ilmee al-Mateen ‘alaa Ihsaan Wa Man Ma’ahu Minal-Mukhaalifeen” (p.5-6) 26<sup>th</sup> July 2000)

Shaikh Ali Hasan also said, “And to give more clarity we say: the branches of perfect Imaan (al-Imaan al-Kaamil) are seventy odd in number, or sixty odd in number – as occurs in the authentic hadeeth. And this – at the same time is the correct, valid Imaan (al-Imaan as-Saheeh).

However, when this perfect Imaan is lacking any of its branches, does this deficiency in them have an effect upon the correct, valid Imaan and render it a corrupt and false Imaan?! Or does the effect that results from this (deficiency) fall upon the perfect Imaan such that it now becomes deficient (naaqis)?!<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> In other words if someone does not perform one of the branches of Imaan, does this affect its perfection (such that a person becomes a deficient believer) or does it affect its validity (such that a person becomes a disbelieving apostate)?

And refer to what has been said by Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan bin Hasan Aal ash-Shaikh, “**When you have come to know that both the outward and inward actions are from the reality of Imaan, legislatively, then everything that is a deficiency in those actions whose deficiency does not expel from Islaam, then it is a deficiency in the obligatory perfection of Imaan (kamala ul-Imaan al-waajib).**” (Majmoo’at ur-Rasaa’il wal-Masaa’il 2/3).

**And what are the branches of Imaan, from the branches of perfect Imaan (al-Imaan as-Kaamil), the negation or absence of which makes this correct, valid Imaan (al-Imaan as-Saheeh) corrupt (and invalid)?**

Is it the 73<sup>rd</sup> branch?<sup>6</sup> Or the 64<sup>th</sup>? Or the 51<sup>st</sup>? The 49<sup>th</sup>? The 30<sup>th</sup>? The 25<sup>th</sup>? The 17<sup>th</sup>? The 6<sup>th</sup>? The 5<sup>th</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, or 3<sup>rd</sup>?

**There only remains the two branches of Prayer and the Kalimah of Tawheed.** As for the first, then there is a difference of opinion concerning it from the fiqh (jurisprudence) point of view – and it varies between what is more or less preferable (rajih wa marjooh) and what is correct and in error (sawaab wa khata'). Therefore, nothing remains except for the kalimah of Tawheed (the Shahadah) – which is actually a point of unanimous agreement of the people of Knowledge from Ahl us-Sunnah – absolutely, the one who abandons it is a disbeliever and apostate, outside the fold of Islaam<sup>7</sup>...”<sup>8</sup> End of Shaikh Ali Hasan's words.

Now, after you have contemplated upon the above words, and after you have understood part 1 above, let us proceed in earnest to unleash the second whippage:

The neo-Qutubite theoreticians, may Allaah restrain them and protect the Ummah from their evil, have confused two matters, or have treated two separate issues as one and the same. What do we mean here? **What is meant is that the Murji'ah would claim that actions are not from Imaan and that a person who has no actions is a Believer, perfect in his Imaan, so long as he had tasdeeq, or ma'rifah, or pronounced the Shahaadah. That he can reach perfection in Imaan without any actions.**

Now, what the neo-Qutubite theoreticians have done, is twisted the issue and made it into something else, which is that they declare anyone who does not make takfir of a person who has no good deed to his credit to be a Murji', to have fallen into Irjaa' and to have claimed that actions are not from Imaan. See the difference between the two scenarios?!

<sup>6</sup> Removing something harmful from the floor!!

<sup>7</sup> And it is from this perspective that Shaikh Ali Hasan included in his reply to the Permanent Committee the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab – rahimahullaah – in ad-Durar as-Sunniyyah (1/70), “The five pillars of Islam. The first of them [by which he disbelieves] is the two testimonies of faith. And then the remaining four pillars. **However, if he affirms their obligation but abandons them out of neglect, then even though we fight him in order to make him act upon them, we do not declare him a disbeliever by mere abandonment of them.** The scholars have differed about the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer out of laziness, without wilful denial, juhood. **So we do not perform takfir on account of anything except what the all of the scholars are united upon, and that is the two testimonies of faith.**”

And this view is also one of the views reported from Imaam Ahmad as is mentioned in Tabaaqat al-Hanaabilah (1/343), “A man does not leave Islaam with anything except committing Shirk with Allaah the Mighty. Or by rejecting the obligatory duties Allaah – the Mighty and Majestic - has laid down, wilfully opposing them (jaahidan). However if he left them out of laziness or neglect, he will be subject to Allaah's will. If He wishes, He will punish him and if He wishes, He will reward him.”

<sup>8</sup> “Tanweer al-Arjaa Bi Tahqeeq Masaa'il il-Imaan wal-Kufr wal-Irjaa” (p.136)

The Murji'ah say that anyone who merely brings what they define to be Imaan (which excludes actions) is a Believer, perfect in his Imaan. Now, do those people who speak with the saying that actions are a condition for the perfection of Imaan (shart kamaal), mean by this that a person who has no actions, is actually perfect in his Imaan?! If that is the case then why have they attributed perfection to the bringing of actions?!! How can speaking with this indicate or be the same as what the Murji'ah are upon. This saying means, actions perfect Imaan, whereas the Murji'ah say, Imaan is already perfect, without actions(!!).

So the neo-Qutubiyyah have played upon these terms “shart kamaal” and “shart sihhah” in order to cause confusion and to ascribe Irjaa' to those who are free from it.

Actually, what the crux of the matter revolves around is the word “condition” (shart) and what is actually meant by it. Since, in the Arabic language, it means “**something that is external to something else**”. Let us explain: Wudhoo is a condition for the validity of the prayer. But wudhoo, as an entity, is not part of prayer, it is external to it. So here when we have said “Wudhoo is a condition for the validity of prayer”, we have used the word “condition” (shart) in its strict linguistic meaning.

Now, we can also say that Surah Fatihah is a condition for the validity of prayer. But here, Surah Fatihah is actually part of prayer, and integral to it, within it, tied to it, as opposed to Wudhoo, which is something external to it. So here we have not used the word “condition” (shart) from its linguistic aspect, but only from the aspect of a Sharee'ah understanding.

But in both of the above, we have given examples of matters that render the prayer invalid if they are not brought, regardless of whether they are integral to the prayer or external to it.

Now we can also say that saying the first tashahhud, and saying “rabbanaa walakal-hamd” and other affairs complete and perfect the prayer and are a condition for its completion and not its validity. Yet this at the same time does not mean that just because we have treated them as **perfecting** the prayer (i.e. render the prayer deficient if they are left, but not invalid), that they are external to the reality of prayer.

Therefore, we have to separate those actions which if left, nullify the prayer, from those actions which if left, render it deficient and incomplete.

So now the issue comes back to the following: **What actions of the limbs are there which if left or abandoned render Imaan invalid, such that takfir can be made?** And this is exactly what has been explained in the words of Shaikh Ali Hasan above. And bearing in mind the difference of opinion on the abandonment of prayer, there are none, as has preceded in the words of Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab. Therefore, saying that all the actions of the limbs are a condition for the perfection of Imaan, does not mean that one has taken them outside the reality of Imaan<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> And what will make this even more clear is when you read the aathaar in Part 4 that explain that Imaan has an asl, root, and furoo', branches.

It is for this reason, that the word “condition” creates ambiguity firstly, and should not be used and secondly, it has not been reported from the Salaf. But in light of this explanation, let us revisit the issue. The issue boils down to what does a person intend by all of this. If a person means by “condition for the perfection” that actions are required to perfect Imaan, **then this at the same time, does not mean that he has claimed that actions are not from Imaan, or external to its reality.** And this has nothing to do with the beliefs of the Murji'ah. But if a person means by “condition for the perfection” that actions are external to the reality of Imaan, then that is a clear error(!). But we do not see that anyone actually uses this term to intend this meaning – since the Murji'ah do not even use this term – as has preceded, since the term itself is against their principles...(!), for if Imaan is already complete, why should actions then perfect it...(!).

Summarising the above, if someone says that “actions are a condition for the perfection of Imaan”, meaning that if someone merely brings tasdeeq in the heart, and pronouncement of the Shahaadah upon the tongue, then the completion and perfection of Imaan will be brought about by action – then this does not resemble what the Murji'ah are upon at all, for they say that by mere tasdeeq alone, or ma'rifah alone, or tasdeeq in the heart and the Shahaadah upon the tongue, a person has become a perfect, complete believer.

But as we stated earlier, the Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah have twisted the issue and made it such that whoever says that a person who does not do a single good deed (while having tasdeeq in his heart, and having pronounced the Shahaadah upon his tongue) remains a Muslim, then such a one has fallen into Irjaa' and separated actions from Imaan – and this is baatil to the bone, and has nothing to do with the actual beliefs of the Murji'ah, since to the Murji'ah, such a one was considered to be complete in his faith, a perfect Believer, whereas, this issue is related to whether a person's Islaam remains or not and to the issue of takfir.

And because it is almost impossible for anybody to know with certainty, that a person who has the basis of Imaan (that is tasdeeq in the heart and affirmation on the tongue), has not done a single good deed, bearing in mind the difference of opinion that exists on the issue of leaving the prayer, then it is incorrect to make the judgement of takfir merely on account of suspicion. And this is why Shaikh Ali Hasan included in his reply to the Permanent Committee the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab – rahimahullaah – in ad-Durar as-Sunniyyah (1/70), “The five pillars of Islam. The first of them [by which he disbelieves] is the two testimonies of faith. And then the remaining four pillars. **However, if he affirms their obligation but abandons them out of neglect, then even though we fight him in order to make him act upon them, we do not declare him a disbeliever by mere abandonment of them.** The scholars have differed about the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer out of laziness, without wilful denial, juhood. **So we do not perform takfir on account of anything except what the all of the scholars are united upon, and that is the two testimonies of faith.**”

Now for a detailed treatment of this issue (and all related matters), that is on the one who has the basis of Imaan, but does not bring any good deeds, refer to the article MSC060008 (The Halabi Papers: Part2) and within there you will find what explains this matter well.

Refer to that, preferably now – and read the chapter titled, “Are actions a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan or a condition for its perfection (kamaal)”. There are additional important points to be made concerning these terms which cannot be covered here, but which are covered in the abovementioned article, such as the fundamental link between the heart and the limbs and so on. Once you have read the whole of that, and understood it, then we can move on at this point to part 3.

### PART 3: THE DISHONESTY OF ABU FULAAN AL-KANADIE

Know O Sunni, that what Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie has quoted in order to ascribe Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani and to claim that the Imaam separates actions from Imaan, then he omitted the next few statements of the Shaikh on the tape which explain clearly that he considers actions to be fundamental to Imaan and that the actions of the heart are tied to the actions of the limbs. Let us see the discussion but with the additional phrases added...

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** "Our *Shaykh*, what is the place of actions in *Eemaan*? And are they a condition for its completeness<sup>10</sup> or a condition its existence<sup>11</sup>? I hope for clarity on this matter. May Allaah bless you."

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** "What we have understood from the evidences of the Book and the *Sunnah* and from the sayings of the *Imaams* from the *Sahabah* and the *Tabi'een* and the *Imaams* who have witnessed them is that whatever exceeds the actions of the heart and passes it to what has to do with the actions of the body, then it is a condition of the completeness and not a condition for its existence (of *Eemaan*)."

And for this reason, the increase and decrease [in *Eemaan*, which is well known to the *Ulamaa* and whose mention has come in [answer] to numerous questions, indeed it increases on account of these actions and decreases.

**For there is an extremely tight link between the actions of the heart and the actions of the body, for every time Eemaan increases in the heart, its results increase upon the body, and every time action upon the body increases it brings about an increase in Eemaan in the heart.**

And this is what we have understood from what I have just alluded to from the sayings of the Scholars, those who were the most knowledgeable of what the [texts] of the Book and the *Sunnah* indicate [in meaning and import].

And after this O Sunni, after the Shaikh has linked the actions of the body to the actions of the heart, in the way that he did, can it be said that actions are not from Imaan?! Indeed Abu Fulaan al-Kanadi al-Majhool has merely played upon the ignorance of people with respect to these terms (shart kamaal and shart sihhah) in order to befool them – without actually investigating what is actually meant and intended by these terms..., let alone showing his abundance of pseudo-scholarly untrustworthiness. If he had been fair and honest, he would have quoted the likes of these statements to show more clearly, all the various statements of the Shaikh, so that he could do more justice in presenting the Shaikh's actual views – by gathering all his statements and then bringing them together, reconciling them and understanding them in light of each other.

<sup>10</sup> That is "Shart Kamaal".

<sup>11</sup> That is "Shart Sihhah".

But he has instead chosen to highlight only what suits his desires and what he is already upon of the manhaj of Mohammad Qutb and Safar al-Hawaali, from whose fountain he has drunk and nourished himself...

As we stated before, the neo-Qutubiyyah are hell-bent on ascribing Irjaa' to our Imaams. They began with al-Albaani and will move onto Ibn Baaz and then to Ibn Uthaimen.

## PART 4: BETWEEN THE SOPHISTRY OF ABU FULAAN AL-KANADIE AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE IMAAMS OF THE SUNNAH

Let us now quote some of the words of the People of Knowledge of our times on this issue, so we can see the insignificance of these newly-arisen, fresh-newcomers, who have emerged after the death of the two Imaams, in order to cause mischief and tribulation, and who have focused their efforts on the accusation of Irjaa', all in order to push their wicked Qutubite doctrines into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah.

### THE IMAAM AND SHAIKH UL-ISLAAM IBN BAAZ

**Question:** "Are the scholars who speak with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves all of the actions of the limbs while at the same time professing the two testimonies with his tongue and having the basis of Imaan present in his heart from amongst the Murji'ah?"

**Answer:** "No. This one is from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah. Whoever speaks with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves fasting or zakaat or hajj – this one (i.e. the one who leaves these matters) is not a kaafir. However, he has committed a great sin. In the view of some scholars he is a kaafir, however the correct view is that he does not become a disbeliever with the major kufr. As for the one who leaves the prayer then the most correct view (al-arjah) is that this is major kufr when it is abandoned deliberately..."

**Question:** "The actions of the limbs, are they a condition for the perfection (kamala) of Imaan of a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan?"

**Answer:** "The actions of the limbs – such as fasting, charity, zakaat – **they are from the perfection of Imaan (kamaal ul-Imaan)**, and abandoning them constitutes weakness in one's Imaan. As for the prayer, then the correct view is that leaving it is disbelief. **Therefore, when a person performs the righteous actions, then all of that is from the perfection of Imaan (kamaal ul-Imaan).**"

**Source:** "Hiwaar Hawla Masaa'il it-Takfeer Ma'a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz" and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine (no. 94).

After reading the words of Imaam Ibn Baaz, O Sunni, you will come to know that some miskeen, pseudo-intellectual sitting in Canada, passing judgements upon the creed of the Imaams of the Sunnah, the while his mind is filled with the Heretical Writings of Hawali, the book of Bid'ah and Hawaa, "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa", and with the writings of Mohammad Qutb, the well-known Takfiri and Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah, a Takfiri hardcore – you know that such a one is just a pretender, who is in fact attempting to sow the seeds of discord with his writings, and he is insignificant compared to the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah...

By Allaah the Qutubiyyah hate our Imaams, not just Imaam al-Albaani, but Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen as well, they hate the manhaj of these Imaams and they know that these Imaams are a barrier to their innovatory suggestions...



Now O Sunni, let us move on in earnest, and let us finish with a grand finale... the fourth and most severe lashing, by nothing other than hardcore Sunni, Salafi, Athari narrations...

## PART 5: IMAAN HAS AN FOUNDATION (ASL) AND BRANCHES (FUROO')

Brace yourself O Sunni in the face of these narrations, hold tight and sit firm, for they are severe upon the Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah, those who have deviated on the issues of Imaan with their Jins ul-'Amal theory...and these narrations are a thorn in their throats...for they wish to perform takfir of the Servants of Allaah on account of mere suspicion and conjecture...

### Muhammad bin Nasr al-Marwazi (d. 294H)

Stated Muhammad bin Nasr al-Marwazi, in his refutation of the Murji'ah (Ta'dheem Qadr is-Salaat 2/703), "And we say: That Imaan has an asl, foundation. If even an atom's weight is removed from it, the appellation of Imaan will be removed altogether (i.e. the whole of Imaan will be gone). And from whomever this is not removed, the appellation of Imaan will remain with him. **However, after this it increases, adding Imaan on top of his Imaan. Then if there is any decrease in what is additional to this foundation (asl), the actual foundation does not decrease, that which is affirmation (iqraar) that Allaah is the truth and what He says is the truth.** This is because any deficiency with respect to this is actually doubt (shakk) about Allaah, is He true or not? And this is like the example of a date-palm tree that has branches and leaves. **Every time a branch falls from it<sup>12</sup>, the appellation of "tree" remains for it, however after this decrease it is in a state other than what it was before of perfection, but without its naming changing. It is tree that is deficient in its branches, and other trees are more perfect than it since they are complete.** And Allaah the Mighty and Majestic said, "The example of a good word is like a good tree whose foundation (asl) is firmly established and whose branches reach up to the heaven..." to the end of the verse. **So He made the example of this tree an example for the word "Imaan", and He made it have a foundation (asl) and a branch (far')..."**

And this O Sunni, agrees perfectly and completely with the position of Imaam al-Albaani, word for word, letter for letter. And may Allaah enrage the neo-Qutubite pseudo-intellectuals by it...

### Ibn Mandah (d. 395H)

And after mentioning many of the groups of the Murji'ah, Ibn Mandah said, "And Ahl ul-Jamaa'ah said: Imaan is all of the acts of obedience, those of the heart, tongue and all of the limbs, and it has a foundation (asl) and a branch (far'). Its foundation is knowledge of Allaah (ma'rifah) and attestation (tasdeeq) of Him and of what ever came from Him (of revelation) by the heart and the tongue, along with submission (khudoo'), love of Him, fear of Him, reverence of Him and abandoning pride, arrogance and resistance. **So if a person brings this foundation, then he has entered into Imaan and the name of Imaan is applied to him and the rulings pertaining to it come into effect concerning him. And then such a person cannot have perfected (mustakmilan) his Imaan until he acts upon the branches. And the branches are what are made obligatory upon him, or the avoidance of forbidden matters.**" (al-Imaan 1/331).

Now reflect O Sunni, reflect again upon the words of Imaam al-Albaani that the pseudo-intellectual disputer, quoted in order to ascribe Irjaa' to him, pay attention: The Imaam said:

<sup>12</sup> Compare this with what was explained by Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi in Part 2 of this discourse(!!)

“What we have understood from the evidences of the Book and the *Sunnah* and from the sayings of the *Imaams* from the *Sahabah* and the *Tabi'een* and the *Imaams* who have witnessed them is that whatever exceeds **the actions of the heart** and passes it to what has to do with the actions of the body, then it is a condition of the completeness and not a condition for its existence (of *Eemaan*).”

Now reflect how he spoke of the actions of the heart, as being from the *asl*, foundation, and that what follows from that is the *far'*, branch, and see how this is a replica of the statement of Ibn Mandah, word for word, letter for letter...Perish in your rage, and die in your warm fuzzies O enemies of the narrations...!!!

#### **Ibn Hazm (d. 456H)**

Ibn Hazm had errors in the issue of Sifaat yet was praised by the likes of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah in the issues of Imaan and for refuting the Murji'ah comprehensively. He said, “**And he (alaihissalaam) explained that whoever has a seed's weight of goodness will be removed from the Hellfire, then one who has an atoms weight of goodness, and then what is less than that and so on. Until one who had never performed any good at all, except having the testimony of faith for Islaam will be removed from it. Hence, it is obligatory to halt at the texts, since all of them explain each other.**” (al-Fisal 4/90).

And this too is a decisive refutation of the neo-Qutubite disputers, those who feign the gown of Salafiyyah but in fact are confused and mixed up in the agenda of Qutubiyyah. If a person had made tasdeeq in his heart and uttered the Shahaadah, and then died upon that, without having the chance to do any action, then he enters Paradise, and there is nothing that occurs from him that warrants his entry into Hellfire. Since, what was required from him of the required obligatory Imaan, at that time, was brought by him. Hence, those who are actually in the fire and who will be removed are indeed those who brought the *asl*, root or foundation of Imaan, but did not bring any actions...

Ibn Hazm also said, “And whoever neglects all of the actions then he is a sinful believer, deficient in his Imaan, **but does not disbelieve (on account of this).**” (al-Muhallaa 1/40-41 Issue No. 79)

Ibn Hazm also said, “**He did not declare a disbeliever one who abandoned action, but he declared a disbeliever the one who abandoned the saying (i.e. the testimony of faith).** This is because the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) made the judgement of kufr upon the one who refused to make the saying (the testimony), even if he knew of its correctness in his heart. **And he also judged that the one who knew with his heart and pronounced with the tongue to be removed from the Fire, even if he did not do a single deed of goodness.**” (Ad-Durrah Feema Yajib I'tiqaduhu p.337)

Remember, O Sunni, this is the Ibn Hazm, that refuted the Murji'ah extensively and comprehensively – so will the neo-Qutubite disputer charge Ibn Hazm with Irjaa' has ascribed Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani?! And as we shall see, this disputer, al-Kanadie, himself quoted from Ibn Hazm in attempting to ascribe Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani in his 112 page document. And inshaa'llaah, this will be dealt with in due course.... But see O Sunni, have you now come to know the reality of these people?!

Have you seen their behavioural condition, their defunct intellects, and their true and real agendas?! Indeed, they are upon the madhhab of Qutubiyyah and upon the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb, and all of this is just mere sophistry to hide their true and real orientations... they wish to ascribe Irjaa' and misguidance to our Imaams, the while they secretly harbour the heresy of Sayyid Qutb, cleverly disguising it as Salafiyyah, and manipulating in all of that the words and statements of our Scholars... wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

#### **Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali (d. 795H)**

Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali said in explanation of the saying of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) "And then a group of people will be taken out from the Fire who had not done any good whatsoever", he said, **"...And what is meant by his saying, 'who had not done any good whatsoever' is the actions of the limbs, even though they have the foundation (asl) of Tawheed with them..."** (at-Takhweef Min an-Naar p.255). And he also said (p.256), "This proves that those whom Allah will remove through His Mercy, without any intercession (shafaa'ah) from anybody else from the creation, **are the people of Tawheed who had not done a single deed of goodness with their limbs.**"

What then will you say O Sunni, to a people who cause doubts about the authenticity of these statements from the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), because it does not agree with their desires – such as Safar al-Hawaali and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq?! Both of them in their books ("Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'" and "Al-Burhaan 'alaa Anna Taarik al-'Amal Faaqid ul-Imaan" respectively) cause doubts about these statements from the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). And this is the repugnant way of the Ash'ariyyah and the Mu'tazilah... wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

#### **Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728H)**

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "It (Imaan, faith) is made up of

- A **basis (asl)** without which it cannot be complete
- **Obligatory [duties] (wajib)**, whose neglect cause Imaan to be deficient and render the one guilty of this punishable
- **Recommended [duties] (mustahabb)** whose absence cause the greatness of rank to be lost.

And amongst the people are those who wrong their own souls, those who are just in between (following a middle course), and those who are foremost (in goodness) [with respect to their relation to entities and acts such as] hajj, the physical body, the mosque and other such entities, actions and characteristics. And from its various elements [i.e. those that constitute Imaan] are those which if they are not present will reduce it [from being] most perfect, and those which will cause it to fall short of perfection – and this is abandoning the obligatory duties and falling into the forbidden matters.

And from it [i.e. the various elements of Imaan] is that which will cause its **basis (rukn)** to be impaired, and that is the abandoning of **belief (i'tiqad) and speech (qawl)** – and which the Murji'ah and Jahmiyyah claim to be [what justifies] the appellation [of Imaan]. **And by this [classification] will the doubts of all the sects be put to an end. The foundation (asl) [of Imaan] is in the heart and its perfection (kamaal) lies in the outward actions,** in opposition

to Islam since its basis is what is external and its perfection lies in the heart..." Majmoo Fataawaa (7/637).

What will our disputer say concerning Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah?! Does this necessitate that he considers actions to be external to Imaan?! What is all this talbees?! What is this great fraud and deceit against Ahl us-Sunnah...From where have these newly-arisen ones taken their doctrines... You should know that the likes of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie have first been indoctrinated by the books of Mohammad Qutb and Safar al-Hawaali. By reading these books, which are in fact propounding the madhhab of the Khawaarij, the likes of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie have become extremely and highly "**sensitised**" to Irjaa', meaning that they start seeing Irjaa' when it is not even there, indeed this is a form of hallucination. So when, this has become their mental condition, they then seek out words and statements of those from Ahl us-Sunnah in which they think there is Irjaa', but it does not even exist(!). Rather, it exists only in their minds. As Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari said, "All praise is due to Allaah... to proceed... As for the answer that our brother, the Shaikh, Abdul-Kareem, has presented, then our Shaikh al-Albaani (rahimahullaah) is upon the aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah and the Salaf us-Saalih on the issues of Imaan and Takfir, except that some people who do not give the estimation that the Shaikh truly deserves, and who stir in the murky waters (of tribulation), they take some expressions (of the Shaikh) in which there is a generalisation (ambiguity), and then they build upon this (or infer from it) something that the Shaikh does not actually intend (with his words). Hence, the usool (principles) of the Shaikh are in agreement with what Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah are upon. So where is the Irjaa'. There is no Irjaa' except in the minds of those who want to make al-Albaani fall down, not just because of his person, but because of the Manhaj he is upon (that of Tasfiyah and Tarbiyah upon the Manhaj of Nubuwwah)...." End of quote.<sup>13</sup>

### **Muhammad Ibn Jareer at-Tabaree (d. 310H)**

Muhammad Ibn Jareer at-Tabaree said, in his quotation of the madhhab of Ahl us-Sunnah on Imaan, "So some of them said, "**Imaan is the knowledge (ma'rifah) of the heart, affirmation (iqraar) with the tongue, and the actions of the limbs. Whoever brought two of these but did not bring a third one, then it is not permissible for it to be said about him that he is a "Believer (Mu'min)**"<sup>14</sup>". However it is said to him, "If the two matters that he brought are the knowledge of the heart and the affirmation of the tongue, and yet he was neglectful in his actions, then he is a Muslim". And some others who hold onto this saying have said: "If this is the case then we say that he is a Believer (Mu'min) in Allaah and his Messenger, but we do not call him a Believer in the absolute sense." And some others who are also upon the same view said, "If this is the case then it is said to him "Muslim" and it is not said "Believer (Mu'min)", unless the exception (istithnaa) is made such that it is said, 'He is a Believer (Mu'min) if Allaah wills'." (at-Tabseer Fee Ma'aalim ud-Deen pp.188-189).

<sup>13</sup> From the tape, "Questions and Answers in Somalia on the Issue of Irjaa'."

<sup>14</sup> And this proves the correctness of what we have said earlier, that the actual issue is that the Murji'ah would consider a person who had the basis of Imaan in the heart and upon the tongue, to be a Believer, perfect in his Imaan, without any actions...But as for the neo-Qutubites, then to them, the one who does not have a single good deed is an apostate(!), and does not have the asl, root, of Imaan. And in all of this they but speculate in the unseen...for of what practical benefit is this in making the judgement of takfir upon the Muslims?!

And all these narrations O Sunni, indicate in the clearest of manners, that what Imaam al-Albaani has stated is but in agreement with the madhhab of the Salaf, and what Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie al-Majhool, has stated is but mere folly and foolishness, devoid of justice, guidance and light...and if he should now proceed to persist in his arrogation and bring statements concerning “Jins ul-‘Amal”, then let him hasten... for all of his arguments are known and have been anticipated, and they have been refuted by our Scholars wal-hamdulillaah.... So let him proceed...and inshaa’allaah the more he insists, he will only make it more readily apparent that he is upon the Heresy of Hawali, the Qutubi Heresy which was imbibed from Sayyid and Mohammad Qutb... so let him continue to reveal his true orientation...

## Closing Remarks

After understanding everything that has preceded, let us now come O Sunni, and look at the debauchery, the foolishness, and the pitiful ignorance, of the youngster who has taken it upon himself to cast doubt on the aqeedah of the Imaams of the Sunnah – pretending to be covered in the apparel of knowledge and erudition, while making his bareness all but apparent to Ahl us-Sunnah, As-haabul Athar...let us revisit his words at the very beginning...

So this means that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not consider any actions to be from the conditions for the existence of *Eemaan*. Rather, he considered actions of the body to be a condition for its completeness. And this means that he did would consider a person to be a Muslim, even if he abandoned all the actions as long as all the conditions of *Eemaan* in the heart were present.

Have you seen such ignorance of the state of affairs? He does not even investigate into what the words mean (i.e. “shart kamaal” and “shart sihhah”) and what may be intended by them. Rather, he merely relied upon generalisations and ambiguities in order ascribe Irjaa’ to Imaam al-Albaani. Nor does he even realise that to even use this term (shart kamaal) would – in principle - be in contradiction to the teachings of the Murji’ah, if the word shart (condition) was not used in its strict linguistic meaning. Look at all this jahl, (ignorance) and idiocy...Look at this pretence of being a muhaqqiq (verifier) of the aqeedah of Imaam al-Albaani, yet look at the lowest depths of ignorance being displayed... and this fanciful attempt to sit on the throne of the Imaam of the Era...

We leave you with the words of Imaam Ibn Uthaimen once more...

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen also said: **“Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa’ has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa’<sup>15</sup>.** Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah’s pardon – **have jealousy in their hearts.** For when [one of them] sees that a person has been met with acceptance [by the people], he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers]. So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity! We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them.** Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji’ – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication. **Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!”** (Cassette: Makaalmaat Ma’a Mashaayikh ad-Da’wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4) Dated 12/6/2000CE).

<sup>15</sup> And on top of that he does not even know the limitations of his own soul, and the reality of his own self...

Yes, Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie who is grossly and wholly ignorant of Irjaa' and of the worth of the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah... but what led him to this pitiful state?! Indeed he secluded himself with the books of bid'ah and hawaa, those of Safar al-Hawaali and Mohammad Qutb, and so they played havoc with his mental faculties... and all of this was the end result... wal-Iyaadhu billaah. May Allaah guide him and protect him from the desires which but kill the heart and freeze the mind...

And take caution O Sunni, because Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie has come across in a very academic manner, has made an open display of his acknowledgement of Imaam al-Albaani and his excellencies and so on, and hence his sophistry is not as readily apparent as is the sophistry who make the accusation of Irjaa' and at the same time make clear and open their hatred of Imaam al-Albaani. This is where the danger is, beware, he has come across as objective and has used good mannerisms, but by Allaah he has wallowed in error and confusion... and refuge is from Allaah, the common-person may not realise that... This is the nature of hawaa and misguidance... it is beautified and looks appealing and looks like the truth, because it has aspects of the truth, but mixed with baatil, falsehood...

And besides that, he has explained that the reason he has gone to such lengths to explain the Irjaa' of Imaam al-Albaani is because many have held onto his erroneous teachings(!). Now, this is where we see the hizbiyyah manifestly apparent. What is worthy of greater rejection, the teachings of Sayyid Qutb which are held onto millions if not hundreds of thousands, and all of what they contain of the greatest of innovations, let alone statements of kufr and apostasy and let alone what they have caused of the termination of the da'wah, and loss of life and sanctity in the Muslim lands... Is that not worthy of greater rejection? Especially when there exist the deceivers like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah, who like to pass off Sayyid Qutb as being equivalent to Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abdul-Wahhaab and also an "Imaam of Guidance"?!!! Indeed the persistence of this individual and his likes to highlight the Irjaa' of Imaam al-Albaani, and their persistent silence concerning the heresies of the neo-Qutubiyyah [such as takfir of the sinners, mocking and reviling the people of knowledge and the likes] (or the most they will say, "I agree with you, and it is wrong" and words like this) and their fleeing from making an open rejection and open refutation and an open severe warning from the likes of these ones is the greatest of evidences of their true and real orientation...

In short, the only reason this accusation of Irjaa' has come about is because Ahl us-Sunnah do not rush towards the takfir of the Rulers...unlike the Harakiyyoon, Takfiriyyoon...

To conclude the reader is strongly encouraged to read MSC060008 (The Halabi Papers 2) and the section on the use of these terms "Shart Sihhah" and "Shart Kamaal".

And may the prayers and peace be upon Allaah's Messenger, his family, his companions and those who follow him upon Tawheed and Sunnah till the affair is established.



## APPENDIX 1

### **An Open Discussion Concerning Imaan, Kufr, and Takfir The Meeting of al-Anbari with as-Saahah al-Arabiyyah<sup>16</sup>**

Moderator: "In the Name of Allaah, the Most Merciful, Ever-Merciful to His Servants. We firstly welcome the respected Shaikh, Khalid al-Anbari to the United Arab Emirates, alongside his brothers from as-Saahah al-Arabiyyah and we also thank him for his acceptance of our invitation. We request the Shaikh to expand his chest (i.e. be accomodating) and to show patience with respect to the questions and enquiries...

**Q.1** Moderator: "Respected Shaikh, the questioner "Cute" asks, 'What is your belief concerning the issues of Imaan?'"

**A.1** Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari: "All praise is due to Allaah and prayers and peace upon the Messenger of Allaah. I thank the brothers of as-Saahah al-Arabiyyah for arranging this meeting, just like I thank the participants who asked the questions. We ask Allaah that he guides all of us in that which has been differed over concerning the truth.

And my answer to the questioner is in what follows and with Allaah lies all success:

My belief concerning the issues of Imaan is that it consists of the speech and action, it increases and decreases, and people can excel over each other with respect to it. By "speech" I mean the speech of the tongue and the heart and by "action" I mean the action of the heart and the action of the limbs. What is intended by the "speech of the heart" is its assent (tasdeeq) and belief (i'tiqaad). And what is intended by the "action of the heart" is love, hate, loyalty and other such actions of the heart. This is the belief of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah in the various works of aqidah and the compilations of the Sunnah."

**Q.2** Moderator: "Respected Shaikh: The same questioner asks, 'What is the belief of Shaikh Khalid concerning Irjaa'. And are you in agreement with the views of Shaikh al-Albani on the issues of Imaan?'"

**A.2** Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari: "I believe that expelling actions from Imaan is Irjaa' and that saying Imaan does not increase or decrease is Irjaa'. Also, that saying Imaan is mere assent (tasdeeq) is extreme Irjaa' and that saying Imaan is mere speech (of the tongue of the heart) is Irjaa'. Likewise, restricting kufr to the rejection (takdhib) of the heart only is extreme Irjaa' and also saying that all those who have been declared Unbelievers by the Legislator have been declared so due to the absence of assent (tasdeeq) in their hearts, this too is Irjaa'.

---

<sup>16</sup> An open discussion forum on the Internet. This meeting took place between the late hours of 8<sup>th</sup> September 2000 and the early hours of 9<sup>th</sup> September 2000 and participants were given an open field to put forward any questions related to the issues of Kufr, Takfir, Imaan and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. Only selected questions related to the topic have been included here. For all the questions one may read The Anbari Papers, Part 6, at [SalafiPublications.Com](http://SalafiPublications.Com).

Similarly, saying that the various external acts of major kufr are disbelief because they provide knowledge of what is in the heart of rejection (takdhib) is extreme Irjaa'.

And I do not believe that Shaikh al-Albani (rahimahullaah) differs with Ahl us-Sunnah on the issues related to Imaan and Irjaa'. However, certain generalised statements did emanate from the Shaikh, and the one who accused him of Irjaa' did not carry these (generalised) statements upon the other more clear and explicit statements he made in other places. Perhaps, we may be able to give some examples of this later on. And the 'Allaamah, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen – may Allaah pardon him and us and bring about benefit through him for all of us – said, "Whoever accuses Shaikh al-Albani of Irjaa' then he has erred. Either he does not know al-Albani or he does not know what is Irjaa'..." and "... I do not know of any of his statements that indicate Irjaa' ever. However it is those who wish to perform takfir of the people who say about him and those like him that they are the Murji'ah. They do this from the perspective of ascribing evil names (to them)."

**Q.4 Moderator:** "We apologise to brother Ibn Hazm (hafidhahullaah) for removing his questions since they are not related to the topic of discussion... and we move on to the question of Muhammad at-Tameemee who says, 'What are the various types of kufr and can kufr occur through the limbs without their being any connection with the heart?'"

**A.4 Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari:** "Kufr, in the belief of Ahl us-Sunnah, is of six types: the kufr of rejection (takdheeb), the kufr of wilful denial (juhood), the kufr of pride and arrogance (ibaa' wal-istikbaar), the kufr of turning away (i'raad), the kufr of doubt (shakk) and the kufr of hypocrisy (nifaaq).

The Murji'ah restricted kufr to the rejection (takdheeb) of the heart only.

As for the second part of the question, then if he means by that the kufr of the limbs on account of the rejection (takdheeb) that is in the heart, then the answer is that there are some actions of kufr on account of which the one who performs them disbelieves, even if he does not have takdheeb in his heart. These actions are like mocking Allaah and His Messengers, prostrating to an idol and throwing the Qur'aan into filth. A person disbelieves on account of all these actions regardless of whether he makes istihlaal (holds them to be permissible) or does not make istihlaal of them"

**Q.8 Moderator:** "The brother, Abu Aa'id, hafidhahullaah says, 'You said in your book, the one that the Permanent Committee cautioned against, that the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed in general legislation (at-tashree' al-aamm) does not become a disbeliever except by way of istihlaal qalbi (declaring it to be lawful with his heart). The Committee had described this as being an outright fabrication against Ahl us-Sunnah. And this the very madhhab of the Murji'ah... so the one who repeats the likes of these statements then the saying, 'Murji'ah of the Era' holds true of him. However, until now, we have now seen you openly pronounce your repentance to Allaah and your return to the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih... We ask for your to clarify your position... the one that the Senior Scholars and best of the Ulamaa of the Ummah warned against, due to their considering it to be very

far from the manhaj of the Salaf and its being astray from the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah. We ask Allaah that He returns all of us to the truth by His permission.”

**A.8** Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari: “The saying that the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed in general legislation does not disbelieve except by way of Istihlaal (considering it to be lawful) is the very saying of Ahl us-Sunnah and is not a fabrication against them<sup>17</sup>. And saying that this is Irjaa’ is a mere allegation devoid of any evidence. And further, the Murji’ah do not have any statements concerning general legislation such that my agreement or disagreement with their view can be ascertained. But we say that there is a difference between the external actions which cannot be considered to be but the major kufr such as fighting the Prophet, disrespecting the Qur’aan and between the actions which can contain both (major) kufr and what is lesser than that. This is similar to the action of Haatib bin Abee Balta’ah.

A person can become a disbeliever by the first type absolutely, regardless of whether he made istihlaal or not. Refraining from takfir of such a one [after the presence of the conditions and removal of the preventative barriers] is dangerous Irjaa’.

As for the second type, then a person does not disbelieve through them except after his condition has become clearly evident. For the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) became clear of the condition of Haatib and he (the latter) said, “I did not do that out of disbelief and nor as apostasy from my religion and nor out of being pleased with disbelief after Islaam”.

So ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed falls into the second category, not the first. This is because it can be both the major kufr and what is less than that (i.e. the lesser kufr). So perhaps a person was led to general legislation (at-tashree’ al-aamm) due to fear, apprehension, lust or desire. So how can the one who holds onto the tafsil (distinction, clarification) of Ahl us-Sunnah concerning that which can be both (major) kufr and what is less than that be accused with Irjaa’? Subhanallaah, this is a mighty fabrication.

Bring your evidence that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in general legislation is the major kufr that expels from the religion without tafsil (distinction, clarification). So if your evidence is correct and true, then your accusation is true and if your evidence is not correct, then your accusation is false and hence, you have fallen into the saying of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), ‘Whoever says about his brother that which is not to be found in him will be made to dwell in the puss of the Inhabitants of Hell.’ Hence, the asl, foundation, is that the honour of a person is exonerated until he is found guilty with evidence that is more clear than the sun.”

<sup>17</sup> And this view is but the view of Imaam Ibn Baaz, since he does not consider that a ruler can become a disbeliever with any of the forms of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, including ruling by the secular laws, instituting them, tabdeel etc. except by way of belief and istihlaal. As Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi said, “I hope that I am lying when I say this, but I fear that the affair began with al-Albani (that he is a Murji’) and it will end with Ibn Baaz (that he is a Murji’). But I hope that I am lying when I say this..” 29th July 2000, Birmingham. So perhaps the Qutubists ought to make their affair clear that this position is the position of the Extreme Murji’ah, and perhaps they ought to come out of the closet and accuse the other Imaam of Ahl us-Sunnah to be a Murji’ and Jahmi in his aqeedah?!

**Q.10** Moderator: “The questioner, “dall” says, ‘What is the ruling upon the one who reviles Allaah? What is the ruling upon the one who prostrates to an idol? What is the ruling upon the one who throws the Qur’aan in the dung heap?’”

**A.10** Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari: “The answers to these three questions are the same and do not vary. The ruling of kufr is made upon them regardless of whether a person did them out of jest only or deliberately, or whether he made his action lawful (istihlaal) or not.”

**Q.13** Moderator: “The questioner Saif al-Mazroo’i asks, ‘What is the ruling upon the one who mocks Allaah or His Messenger? And if you perform takfir of him, is it because that this act necessitates the rejection (takdheeb) of the heart?’”

**A.13** Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari: “The ruling upon the one who mocks Allaah and His Messenger is that he is a kaafir (Unbeliever) however (his mockery) took place. And it is not because this mockery necessitates the rejection (takdheeb) of the heart.”

**Q.14** Moderator: “Are there any actions which expel from the fold of Islaam (a’maal mukaffirah) in and of themselves in your view?”

**A.14** Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari: “Yes, there are actions which in and of themselves expel from the fold of Islaam such as mockery (of Allaah, His Messenger or the religion) and fighting against the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam).

**Q.15** Moderator: “What is your view concerning the one who says that no one disbelieves unless he desires (yureed) kufr and opens up his chest to kufr?”

**A.15** Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari: “This is an erroneous saying and it opposes the belief of Ahl us-Sunnah. What is necessitated from this the absence of the takfir of Iblees, the Accursed, for he did not intend kufr, and it would also necessitate the absence of the takfir of those who mocked (the Companions) since they did not intend kufr, rather they intended mockery as a means to put an end to the hardships of journey.

And this statement emanates from a faulty understanding of His, the Most High’s saying, “Whoever disbelieves in Allaah after having had faith, except for the one who is compelled but his heart is secure in faith. However the one who opens up his chest to disbelief...” then its correct meaning is ‘the one who opens up his chest to disbelief from amongst those who are compelled to disbelief’ and its meaning is not that the one who disbelieves [i.e. performs an act of major kufr] out of choice does not become a disbeliever except when he opens up his chest to disbelief. And if this is not the case then the first part of the verse contradicts the latter part of the verse.”

### **Closing Remarks**

Moderator: “We close with these questions, due to the time being delayed. We thank the respected Shaikh, Khalid al-Anbari for this blessed meeting, inshaa’allaah. Just like we also thank those who participated and those who read the questions and answers. May Allaah

reward everyone with a goodly reward and may He unite their hearts and their ranks upon goodness and upon a straight path.

And prayers and peace upon our Prophet Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and his Companions.”